## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

Office Action Rejections Summary

Claims 1-15, 17-42, and 44-46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over KIVA "Developing KIVA Applications" (KIVA), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,173,310 of Yost et al. ("Yost").

Claims 16 and 43 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over KIVA "Developing KIVA Applications," in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,173,310 of Yost et al. ("Yost"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,049,847 of Vogt et al. ("Vogt").

Status of Claims

Claims 1-46 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-15, 17-42, and 44-46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over KIVA, in view of Yost. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references. Claim 1 recites:

> A method of streaming a page of data, the method comprising:
> **allocating at least one object corresponding to the page of data, the page of data including one or more sub-components; and**
> **executing the at least one object within a single request to an application server to provide the page, wherein, for each of the one or more sub-components, the executing comprises, creating a proxy corresponding to the sub-component, the proxy representing a functionality of an object corresponding to the sub-component**, having the proxy to return the data corresponding to the sub-component to the at least one object if the corresponding data is in a cache memory, if the corresponding data is not in the cache memory, having the proxy to create the object corresponding to the sub-component to execute the object via a container associated with the object to generate the data

corresponding to the sub-component, to return the generated data to the at least one object, and to store the data in the cache memory.

(emphasis added)

It is respectfully submitted that KIVA and Yost do not teach or suggest a combination with each other. Applicants respectfully submit that it would be impermissible hindsight, based on applicants' own disclosure to combine the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine KIVA and Yost. The Office Action states it would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Yost to KIVA's system to make the sub-components to be in a container because the spreadsheet container is a good format of reports. (Office Action, 10/29/03, page 3). Here, the Office Action merely states an advantage of making the sub-components be in a container, without explaining the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art would have suggested the combination.

Even if KIVA and Yost were combined, the combination would still not result in the limitations of claim 1.

The Office Action states in pertinent part:

> Kiva teaches streaming (streaming result section, p. 98 – 99) page of data (dynamic generate HTML-page, p. 95 paragraph 2) comprising: allocating at least one object corresponding to the page of data, **the page of data including one or more sub-components; and executing the at least one object within a single request to an application** server to provide the page, wherein, for each of the one or more sub-components[.]

(Office Action, 10/29/03, page 2)(emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action's characterization of KIVA. The Office Action purports that one or more sub-components are executed

independently in an object corresponding to the page of data within a single request to an application server. Applicants submit that KIVA does not teach or suggest that one or more sub-components are executed independently in an object corresponding to the page of data within a single request to an application server.

KIVA teaches that in order to cache a portion of a page, an application has to write each portion into a specific page (AppLogic object), which requires that the AppLogic object be submitted individually to the KIVA Enterprise Server (application server). (See, for example, KIVA, page 102). Each AppLogic object has one result cache, and to obtain multiple results (i.e., department A and department B), the AppLogic must be run again "with different input parameters values" (i.e., A and B). (See KIVA, page 103). This shows that in order to process multiple components of an object corresponding to the page of data, **each component must make an additional request by submitting another AppLogic object to the application server** (i.e., KIVA Enterprise Server).

In addition, it appears that the Office Action is improperly attempting to read the "proxy corresponding to the sub-component of the page of data" of claim 1 on the AppLogic of KIVA. The AppLogic of KIVA is an object (See KIVA, page 102), **and is not a proxy representing a functionality of an object** corresponding to the sub-component of page of data. Further, the Office Action has already attempted to use the AppLogic of KIVA to meet the claim limitation of "executing at least one object within a single request to an application server to provide the page."

In contrast, claim 1 recites "allocating at least one object corresponding to the page of data, the page of data including one or more sub-components; and executing the

at least one object **within a single request to an application server** to provide the page" and "creating a proxy corresponding to the sub-components, the proxy representing a functionality of an object corresponding to the sub-component." Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in KIVA teaches allocating and executing an object including one or more sub-components within a single request to an application server, as recited in claim 1. Applicants also submit that nothing in KIVA teaches "creating a proxy corresponding to the sub-components, the proxy representing a functionality of an object corresponding to the sub-component," as recited in claim 1.

Yost teaches a method "for generating information to a plurality of user systems using 'push technology,'" in which users define one or more services. (See Yost, col. 9, lines 60-66). In this step of defining services, the user specifies the content of service. (See Yost, col. 11, lines 24-25). The content of service may "include a text grid, an agent alert, a web uniform resource location (URL), a spreadsheet container, an new sheet container, a text container," and the content of services may be organized into containers. (See Yost, col. 11, lines 29-37). Nothing in Yost is directed towards allocating and executing an object that corresponds to a page of data, which includes one or more sub-components, within a single request to an application server. Further, nothing in Yost is directed towards creating a proxy corresponding to the sub-components, the proxy representing a functionality of an object corresponding to the sub-component. As such, Yost does not cure the deficiencies of KIVA as discussed above. The combination of KIVA and Yost does not teach the limitations of claim 1.

Nothing in KIVA or Yost, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggest "allocating at least one object corresponding to the page of data, the page of data

including one or more sub-components; and executing the at least one object within a single request to an application server to provide the page, wherein, for each of the one or more sub-components, the executing comprises, creating a proxy corresponding to the sub-component, the proxy representing a functionality of an object corresponding to the sub-component," as recited in claim 1. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

Similarly, independent claims 20 and 24-28 include similar limitations of claim 1. Thus, for reason similar to those discussed above, independent claims 20 and 24-28 are patentable over the cited references.

Given that claims 2-19, 21-23, and 29-46 depend from one of the above independent claims 1, 20, and 28, applicants submit that claims 2-19, 21-23, and 29-46 are patentable over the cited reference.

In conclusion, applicants respectfully submit that in view of the arguments and amendments set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome.

If the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Michael Mallie at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges, please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: March 1, 2004

Daniel E. Ovanezian
Registration No. 41,236

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300